

## Remarks

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10-13 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 12 to delete the language objected to by the Examiner. Applicants submit that claim 12 complies with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 4,223,313 to Chabrol. The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chabrol in view of U.S. patent publication 2002/0110013 to Park et al. The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chabrol in view of U.S. patent 5,821,638 to Boys et al.

Chabrol does not disclose the invention recited in claims 1 and 8 since, among other things, Chabrol does not disclose a transmitting part attached to the industrial robot and including an air cored first coil and a first converter for producing an alternating magnetic field from the first coil and a receiving part attached to a tool operatively connected to the robot including a second coil for providing an alternating current by induction from the alternating magnetic field. Rather, Chabrol discloses a known power transfer system that includes a

transformer formed by windings housed in ferrite cores. The claimed invention does not include ferrite cores. As discussed in the specification as page 3, lines 20-25, such structures are very heavy, expensive and brittle. The claimed invention does not suffer from such problems and overcomes the problems of such known structures.

In view of the above, Chabrol does not disclose all elements of the invention recited in claims 1-4, 6, and 8-10. Since Chabrol does not disclose all elements of the invention recited in claims 1-4, 6, and 8-10, the invention recited in claims 1-4, 6, and 8-10 is not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). For an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) no difference may exist between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure. *See Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 U.S.P.Q. 841 (C.A.F.C. 1984).

Along these lines, anticipation requires the disclosure, in a cited reference, of each and every recitation, as set forth in the claims. *See Hodosh v. Block Drug Co.*, 229 U.S.P.Q. 182 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986); and *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The combination of Chabrol and Park et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 5 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest a transmitting part attached to the industrial robot and including an air cored first coil and a first converter for producing an alternating magnetic field from the first coil and a receiving part attached to a tool operatively connected to the robot including a second coil for providing an alternating current by induction

from the alternating magnetic field. As discussed above, Chabrol suggests a known power transfer system that includes a transformer formed by windings housed in ferrite cores. The Examiner only cited Park et al. as suggesting a printed circuit board. Park et al. does not suggest the coil structure of the claimed invention.

In view of the above, the combination of Chabrol and Park et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 5. Therefore, the invention recited in claim 5 is not obvious in view of the combination of Chabrol and Park et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Chabrol and Boys et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 7 and 11-13 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest a transmitting part attached to the industrial robot and including an air cored first coil and a first converter for producing an alternating magnetic field from the first coil and a receiving part attached to a tool operatively connected to the robot including a second coil for providing an alternating current by induction from the alternating magnetic field. As discussed above, Chabrol suggests a known power transfer system that includes a transformer formed by windings housed in ferrite cores. The Examiner only cited Boys et al. as suggesting a control unit including a microprocessor and memory. Boys et al. does not suggest the coil structure of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, the combination of Chabrol and Boys et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claim 5. Thus, the invention recited in claim 5 is not obvious in view of the combination of Chabrol and Boys et al. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of

this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not anticipate the claimed invention or make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based upon the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this case, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 24, 2009

/Eric J. Franklin/  
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134  
Attorney for Applicants  
Venable LLP  
575 Seventh Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: 202-344-4936  
Facsimile: 202-344-8300